



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Asokan notes.—By TRUMAN MICHELSON, Ethnologist in the Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D. C.¹

1: *nāsaṃtaṃ*.

Lüders, in his 'Epigraphische Beiträge' (*Sitzb. d. kön. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, 1913, p. 988-1028), considers *nāsaṃtaṃ* on the Delhi-Sivalik, Deli-Mirat, Allahabad, Radhia, and Mathia versions of Asoka's Pillar-Edicts to be a participle to *nathi*, and to be divided into *nā* and *saṃtaṃ*. This is impossible because *nā* 'not' never occurs in these dialects, while *no* (as Lüders remarks) is common; and furthermore we can be confident a participle to *nathi* (Skt. *nāsti*) would have a formation similar to Sanskrit *asanti*-, Pāli *asanto*, Amg. Prākṛit *asanti*-, Māhārāṣṭri Prākṛit *asaī*. For these last two see Pischel, *Gramm.* § 560.

2: *asvatha-saṃtaṃ*.

I treated the difficult phrase *abhītā| asvatha-saṃtaṃ*, DS. 4. 12, 13 (*abhītā| asvatha-saṃ* . . ., DM. 12, 13; *abhīta-asvathā-saṃtaṃ*, R. 4. 19, M. 4, 23; *abhīta-asvathā* . . ., Rā. 4. 17) in IF. 23. 232-234. There can be no doubt that DS. and DM. *abhītā* is a nom. pl. as is *abhīta* of R.M.Rā. in accordance with the law of shortening in the dialects of these versions of the Pillar-Edicts: see IF. 23. 228f. DS. and DM. *asvatha-saṃtaṃ* I considered a copulative compound 'confidently and quietly'², and held that the *asvathā* of R.M.Rā. was a simple lengthening of *asvatha*-.³ Lüders, l. c., 1010, 1011, rejected this and went back to the old view that *asvatha* and *saṃtaṃ*, and similarly *asvathā-saṃtaṃ*, were nominative plurals, because he did not think my translation suitable and because he could find no exact parallel for the lengthening of the *ā* of *asvathā* in Wackernagel, *AiGr.* 2. 1 § 56. At the same time he acknowledged he could not explain away the phonetic difficulties which, as I pointed out, such a translation involves. Leaving *saṃtaṃ* aside we would have DS.DM. **asvathā* and R.M.Rā. **asvatha* if the texts were to be translated the old way; and it will be observed

¹ Printed by permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

² See Whitney, *Skt. Gr.*³ §§ 1247j, 1311.

³ See Whitney, l. c., § 247.

that this is just the opposite to the actual texts. If any one is rash enough to make five emendations to make the texts agree with his preconceived notion of what they ought to mean, he may do so, but he can not expect others to follow him. Let us now turn to *saṃtaṃ*. Lüders, probably seeing that Kern's and Senart's attempts to justify this as a nom. pl. were untenable as I have shown, op. cit., brings forward Kālsī *saṃtaṃ* at 8. 22 as support to the old interpretation of *saṃtaṃ* of the Pillar-Edicts. Certainly Kālsī *saṃtaṃ* is a participle (Girnār *saṃto*, Shb. *sato*, Mans. *saṃtaṃ*, Dh. no correspondent, J. a lacuna), but it is a nom. singular masculine, not plural, as is shown by the preceding *lājā* (Girnār *rājā*, Shb. Mans. *raja*, Dh. *lājā*). Hence it is no support at all.⁴

I grant that there is no exact parallel for the lengthening of the *ā* of *asvathā* cited by Wackernagel, l. c.; but we do find near-parallels, and these occur in Pāli and Prākṛit also. And on the inscriptions of Asoka we find partial parallels such as DS. *anūpaṭipamṇe*, *abhīhāle*, even if they apparently do not chance to occur on R.M.Rā.: it will be remembered that even DS. has only one instance in edicts 1-6, and there are no correspondents to DS. 7 to enable us to determine whether this is a feature of DS. only or whether it occurs also in other dialects of the Pillar-Edicts. In spite of Lüders I can not see that the translation I have given to *asvathā-saṃtaṃ* is unsuitable.⁵ Phonetically it at least satisfies the requirements of DS. and DM.; nor do I think I am over-bold in my interpretation of the final *-ā* of *asvathā*. But if Professor Lüders or any one else will make a suggestion that has no phonetic uncertainties, and can justify *saṃtaṃ* as a nom. pl. of a participle, without involving violent textual emendations—I will be ready to accept it. Till then I shall adhere to my interpretation. Incidentally I add that Lüders' explanation of DS. *asvathā* at 4. 4 and *viyatadhāti* at DS. 4. 11 may be right, but my explanations are fully as probable. For the principle of Lüders' solution see Michelson, IF. 23. 238, 239.

⁴It can hardly be denied that Māgadhan *kalamtaṃ* is pl. as well as sing. But only on the 'Detached Edicts' is it pl., and there it does not occur as sing. On the Rock-Edicts it is singular only. Hence it is not a good parallel. Shb. and Mans. *-mtaṃ* are Māgadhisms (so Lüders).

⁵My interpretation of *saṃtaṃ* is the same as that of Burnouf: see *Lotus*, 746.

3: Girnār *athā*.

Lüders, l. c., 1018 considers Girnār *athā* at 12. 8 a simple mistake for *athāya* which is found quite often. He says 'das *ya* ist vor dem folgenden *ya* von *yvāpatā* ausgelassen.' This is simple nonsense. Lüders should have generously acknowledged that Senart, Konow, and Pischel⁶ anticipated him in this. If it is an error, it is surely due to the preceding *etāya*. Formerly I accepted *athā* as genuine, but explained it as being due to haplology: see JAOS. 31. 240. As it can equally well be explained as a case of haplography, and since datives of *a*-stems in *ā* do not occur in this dialect, even if they do in other dialects,⁷ I think this last explanation is to be preferred. Lüders is quite right in continuing 'für unsern Dialekt [DS.] kann es natürlich auf keinen Fall etwas beweisen' for the dative sing. of Girnār and Pāli *a*-stems is in *-āya*, that of the dialects of the Pillar-Edicts in *-āye*: see JAOS. 31. 241.

4: On the gender of *pālanā*, *sukkhīyanā*, and *dasaṇā*.

Lüders, l. c., 999 takes *pālanā* as a nom. sing. feminine while I took it as a nom. pl. neuter: see IF. 23. 249. Lüders completely ignores the evidence of the Delhi-Mirat correspondent, namely, [*pāla*] *naṃ* which can be nothing else than a nom. sing. neuter. In the face of Sanskrit *pālanam*, Pāli *pālanam*, both of which are neuter, we cannot resort to such desperate shifting of gender. However, it is not necessary to consider the *-ā* a Vedic survival: *-nā* may be for *-nāni* to avoid two successive syllables with *n*. Similar instances of haplology will at once be recalled. The loss of final *ni* of course would have to be early to account for the *-na* (not *-nā*) of the Radhia, Mathia, and Rāmpūrvā correspondent: see IF. 23. 228f.

Lüders, *ibidem*, takes as a nom. sing. fem. also *sukkhīyanā*, which I took as a nom. pl. neuter. Lüders apparently is unaware that the compound *sukkhīyana dukkhīyanam* (so) at DS. 4. 6 and its correspondents *sukkhīyanadukkhīyanam* at R. 4. 16, M. 4. 19 with *-na*-, not *-nā*-, compel us to consider *sukkhīyana*- as neuter in gender. The Rā. correspondent at 4. 14 is damaged

⁶ On revision I note that Kern, *Jaartelling*, 66, also made the same correction. The other early writings on things Asokan are not accessible to me as I write these lines.

⁷ Girnār *nicā*, which Bühler takes as standing for *nicāya*, is too weak a support to sustain such a belief: see JAOS. 31. 239.

at the end but points in the same direction: *sukhīyanadu-*. We can not assume a desperate shift of gender in the case of *sukhīyanā*; the explanation is as above; in any case Lüders himself allows a few cases of nom. plurals of neuters in *-ā*.

Similarly Lüders holds *-dasaṇā* of the Girnār redaction of the Rock-Edicts in the compounds *vimānadasaṇā* and *hastidasaṇā*, both at 4. 3, also to be a nom. sing. feminine, as likewise Kālsī *vimānadasaṇā* at 4. 9. That both are neuter pl. is shown by Dhauli *vimānadasaṇaṃ* (4. 13), Shāhbāzgarhi *vimānanam draṣaṇaṃ* (4. 8). The Mansehra correspondent is indecisive. Sanskrit *darśanam* and Pāli *dassanaṃ*, both of which are neuter, also guarantee that Girnār *-dasaṇā*, Kālsī *-dasaṇā* are neuter.^s

Girnār *paṭivedanā* at 6. 2 as a nom. sing. feminine is adduced by Lüders to show that *pālanā*, *sukhīyanā*, and *-dasaṇā* are also nom. sing. feminine. First it should be noted that the correspondents in the other versions, to wit, K. [*paṭ*]ivedanā, Dh. (*p*)aṭivedanā, J. *paṭivedanā* (so), Shb. and Mans. *paṭivedana*, support the Girnār form. Secondly Sanskrit *vedanā* is a decisive proof that *paṭivedanā* (and its variants) is a nom. sing. feminine. Now the correspondents in other versions (see above) and internal evidence show that *pālanā*, *sukhīyanā*, and *-dasaṇā* are neuter; and Sanskrit *pālanam*, Pāli *pālanam*, Sanskrit *darśanam*, Pāli *dassanaṃ* (which are all neuter) verify this conclusion for *pālanā* and *-dasaṇā*; while Pāli neuters in *ana*

^s Kern, *Jaartelling*, 51f, saw the difficulty; Senart, IA. 21. 102, pronounced Kālsī *-dasaṇā* a neuter pl., which of course implies that Girnār *-dasaṇā* is likewise one. See also Johansson, *Shb.* 2. 69, 70. Lüders' list of neuter plurals in *-ā* is incomplete. Hence it is possible that Girnār *-dasaṇā* may be a Vedic survival. Observe also *vimāna-darśana* in Varāhamihira's *Brhatsamhitā*, 46. 90 as cited by Hultzsich in his observations on Asoka's Fourth Rock-Edict in JRAS. Hultzsich himself does not touch on the gender of Girnār *-dasaṇā*. Additional proof that Girnār *-dasaṇā* is neuter is to be found in Girnār *dasanam* at 8. 5 (Shb. *draṣanam* with Māgadhan dental *n* for *ṇ* (see IF. 24. 53) exactly as Girnār *dasane* at 8. 3 (twice), Shb. *draṣane* (8. 17 [twice]), and Mans. *draṣane* (8. 35 [twice], 8. 36) have Māgadhan final *-e* as shown by Kālsī, Jaugada, Dhauli *dasane* (see K. 8. 23, J. 8. 11, Dh. 8. 4, 8. 5). Franke, *Pāli und Sanskrit*, p. 106, 152, also holds there are a few cases of neuter plurals of *a*-stems in *-ā*. Konow's essay on the Girnār dialect (in *Akad. Afhand. til S. Bugge*) is not accessible to me. Senart, *Les inscriptions*, 1, p. 100 held that *-dasaṇā* had final *-ā* for *-aṃ* or that it was neuter pl. The first hypothesis naturally is excluded: see JAOS. 31. 239, 240.

from secondary roots confirm us in holding *sukhīyanā* to be also neuter: see IF. 23. 249. Hence *paṭivedanā* is not pertinent evidence regarding the gender of the words under discussion.

Jaugaḍa -*saṃtīlanā* at 6. 5 is also brought forward by Lüders to show *pālanā*, *sukhīyanā*, and -*dasanā* are feminines. But it is not germane at all, for the concordance of all versions, and the internal evidence of each separate redaction, both show that it is feminine; whereas all the evidence of this nature points diametrically against this in the case of the three words *pālanā*, *sukhīyanā*, and -*dasanā*, as I have shown above.

Delhi-Sivalik *sukhāyanāyā* at 7². 3, an undoubted feminine, is also used by Lüders to back his case. But *sukhāyanāyā* has not the same formation as *sukhīyanā*, and is supported as a feminine by the preceding *vividhāyā*, whereas internal evidence shows *sunhīyanā* is neuter (note the compound *sukhīyana dukhīyanam*, *sukhīyanadukhīyanam*). Moreover we have no correspondents to control DS. 7. For these reasons we shall not be guided by *sukhāyanāyā*.

If I have spent much space on the discussion of the gender of the words in question, it is because Lüders has simply ignored the evidence on the first two presented in IF. 23. 249.

5 : Delhi-Sivalik *lāja*, *siya*.

Lüders, l. c., 1010, overlooks the fact that I anticipated his explanation of Delhi-Sivalik *lāja*, *siya* by some years: see IF. 23. 226, 238, 239.

6: Girnār *karu*.

I am glad to see that Lüders, l. c., 1016, rejects Franke's explanation of Girnār *karu*, as I had done some years ago: see JAOS. 31. 244.

7: Gerunds in *tu*, *tī*.

Lüders, l. c., 1024, completely passes over the fact that some years ago I showed that gerunds in *tu* in the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions of the Rock-Edicts are 'Māgadhisms,' and that the one in *tī* is proper to their dialect: see JAOS. 30. 80, 86, 91; AJP. 31. 60. His explanation of *apahaṭā*, which, as he states, was formerly held by Kern, as a nomen agentis, and not a gerund, is certainly correct. Lüders shows the views of both Senart and Bühler are untenable.

8: The locative singular of *a*-stems.

Lüders, l. c., 989, 990 treats the locative singular of *a*-stems in

various Asokan dialects in the elucidation of a single passage. He rightly holds that the true native forms in the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions are *-e* and *-aspi*, and that *-asi* in them is a 'Māgadhism.' This last is hardly news, as Senart and Franke both recognized it, even if Johansson apparently was unaware of this. But I think I was the first to point out that *-aspi* was actually a true native form of the dialect of Shb. and Mans.: see AJP. 30. 285, 286, JAOS. 30. 83. Lüders is quite right in denying an *-e* locative to the Māgadhan dialects. But I think it a little venturesome to emend *Nābhake* of the Kālsī version, because in some respects the true native dialect of this redaction agrees with the dialects of the Girnār, Shāhbāzgarhi, and Mansehra texts as opposed to the Māgadhan dialects: see JAOS. 30. 90; 31. 247.

9: On the etymology of Shb. *niraṭhriyaṃ*, Mans. *nirathriya*.

Lüders, l. c., 991, quite overlooks the fact that his etymology of these words was anticipated by Johansson years ago: see Johansson, *Der dialekt d. Shb.*, 151 (37 of the reprint); and compare Michelson, AJP. 30. 294, 295.

10: Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra phonetics.

Grierson, JRAS. 1913, p. 682, 683, from the fact that in the modern Piśāca languages of India such forms as *grām* (Sanskrit *grāma*) and *krom* (Sanskrit *karman*) occur, thinks that such forms as *dhrama-* on the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra inscriptions may represent the actual pronunciation with as much probability as that they are merely graphical representations of *dharma-*, etc. I am sure all will appreciate Grierson's attempt to correlate modern vernaculars with the Asokan ones. But I am not convinced by his argument. First, two thousand years have to be bridged over; secondly, the modern Piśāca languages of India are not linear descendants of the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra inscriptions, even if in certain phonetic points there are resemblances between all; thirdly—and this is the fundamental objection—the evidence of the inscriptions themselves distinctly is opposed to such a view. That the manner in which *r* appears in conjoint consonants on these inscriptions is a mere matter of graphical convenience is shown by *paṭri*, *praṭi* (Skt. *prati*); *viyapraṭa*, *viyapaṭra* (Skt. *vyāpṛtās*); *sraṇa*, *savṛa-* (Skt. *sarva-*); *vagreṇa* (Skt. *vargena*); *grabhagaraspi* (Skt. *garbhāgāra-*); *mrugo* (Skt.

mrgas); *vudhrana* (Skt. *vrddhānām*); *-vrudhi* (Skt. *vrddhi-*); etc. I have exhaustively treated this point in AJP. 30. 289, 290, 423, 424, 426; 31. 56, 57, 62. Moreover if *thr* is not graphical for *rth*, then *tn* can not be for *nt*. So with the best will in the world, I fear we are not justified in following Grierson.

There is another point of view also to be considered. In point of time the inscriptions are nearer Sanskrit or Vedic than modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars; so we should expect the first two to shed more light on the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redaction of the Fourteen-Edicts than the latter; and as a matter of fact both Johansson and myself have made it clear that this dialect, though it has certain Middle Indic features, yet as a whole is far closer to Sanskrit than to other Middle Indic dialects. Hence I shall continue to consider *dhrama-* of the Asokan inscriptions as merely graphical for *dharma-*; etc.

11: Gīrnār *likhāpayisaṃ*.

Wackernagel, *Z. verg. Sp.* 43. 290-291, discusses the origin of the Middle Indic future termination *-ssaṃ* in the first person singular. Gīrnār *likhāpayisaṃ* is cited in this connection. Wackernagel's explanation is that the form in *-ssaṃ* (the Gīrnār word has *s* graphically for *ss*) must be ancient, and he accordingly derives it from *-syā* because apparently in some Middle Indic dialects final *ā* and *aṃ* interchange. This *-syā* would then be an archaism, cf. Avestan *vaxšyā*. I think every one will want very substantial proof to admit such an extraordinary archaism; and as a matter of fact Wackernagel's explanation is untenable as *-ā* and *-aṃ* do not interchange in the Gīrnār dialect whether they do or not in other Middle Indic dialects: JAOS. 31. 239, 240. Incidentally I remark that both Johansson and myself have tried to show that in many cases where *-ā* and *-aṃ* apparently interchange it is due to analogy, and is not phonetic. If we are both wrong in this, it will not affect the evidence of the Gīrnār dialect.

12: Māgadhan *kachati*.

The meaning of Māgadhan *kachati* is absolutely certain; as shown by Gīrnār *kāsaṭi*, Shb. Mans. *kaṣaṭi* (both from **karṣyati*) we have a word that in meaning corresponds to Sanskrit *karīṣyati*. As Johansson, *Shb.* 2. 24, saw, any attempt to

derive *kachati* from **karṣyati* must fail. Accordingly he suggested that it was a future from a present stem *kajj* (from **karyati*, cf. Prākṛit *kajjai*), thus **kajjisyati* > *kacchati* (written *kachati*). This fails because *ry* does not become *jj* in a single Asokan dialect. Franke, *Pāli und Sanskrit*, 99, went back to the older view, but seeing the difficulty queried if we might not have an 'überleitendes *t*,' that is *rtsy* from *rṣy*. For *rtsy* would inevitably result in *cch* (written *ch*). See also Franke, l. c., p. 100, 119, 132. This unfortunately will not answer, for *rṣ* and *rṣy* are treated alike in all Middle Indic dialects: as we have *ss* (written *s*) in the Māgadhan dialects from *rṣ* (e. g. *vasa-*, Skt. *varṣa-*), we should expect **kassati* from **karṣyati*. And Delhi-Sivalik *isyā*, etc. (Skt. *īrṣyā*) is opposed to such a theory. Accordingly I venture to give a new solution to our problem, and hope it will prove more satisfactory. I wish to acknowledge that Franke's suggestion gave me the clue. In Sanskrit the roots *kr̥* and *kṛt* coincide in certain forms. Thus the gerund *-kr̥tya* can be either *-kr̥-tya* or *kṛt-ya*; similarly the root word *kṛt* can go back to either *kr̥* or *kṛt*. The infinitives *kartum* and **karttum* would phonetically fall together in Middle languages as would probably the gerunds *kṛtvā* and **kṛttvā*. And in Sanskrit there is one root *kr̥* 'do, make,' another one 'cut.' In a word I believe that *kacchati* (written *kachati*) is simply the phonetic correspondent to Skt. *kartsyati* 'he will cut,' and is due to the confusion of the roots *kr̥* and *kṛt* outlined above. References to the phonetic and morphological phenomena in my discussion are left out, because the facts are well known.

13: Shb. *śruṇeyu*, etc.

Some time ago I pointed out in KZ. 43. 351 that Pāli *sunōti* was derived from **śruṇōti* not **śṛṇōti* (Sanskrit *śṛṇōti*) as shown by Shāhbāzgarhi *śruṇeyu*, Mansehra *śruṇey[u]*, Girnār *srūnāru*, and not from either one as Keller held. Amg. Prākṛit *padissune* (cited by Pischel, *Gramm.*, § 503) with *ss* distinctly points also to a present **śruṇōti*, not **śṛṇōti*. Accordingly we must consider such Prākṛit and Pāli forms as have *s*(*Mg.ś*) in compounds as instances of re-composition from the simple uncompound ones which phonetically would have but one initial sibilant. This is quite aside from the question as to which formation is most original.